



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,115	12/12/2003	Takaki Naito	21334-1287	1901
29450	7590	04/22/2005	EXAMINER	
BARLEY SNYDER, LLC 1000 WESTLAKES DRIVE, SUITE 275 BERWYN, PA 19312			GILMAN, ALEXANDER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/735,115

Applicant(s)

NAITO ET AL.

Examiner

Alexander D. Gilman

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2833

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 -6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fogg in view of Gwiasdowski et al or Bassett and Lee or Rechle .

With regard to claims 1,2, 4 Fogg (US 5,766,027) disclose an electrical cable assembly, comprising:

a cable (6), and

electrical connectors (1) which are fixed on both ends of the cable and include an electrical contact and a housing storing the electrical contact,

wherein electrical connector has an equalizer circuit comprising (4) a substrate electrically interconnected to the cable and to the connector contact.(24)

Fogg does not explicitly disclose that the housings having interchangeable mating surfaces and at least one of the electrical connectors has a visual indicator different from that of the other electrical connector.

The interface configuration at the ends of the cable connector is predetermined by the corresponding configuration of components which are connected with the cable connector. For example, Gwiasdowski et al (US6,793,515) disclose (col. 7, lines 11-12) identical connections or Bassett (US 6,687,77)5 disclose (140) identical connections on both sides of the cable connector .

Lee (US 5,529,513) discloses a visual indicator (18a) or Reichle (US 6,520,796) disclose a visual indicator .

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Fogg with interchangeable mating surfaces and a visual indicator , as taught by Gwiasowski et al and Lee et al , to connect components with identical connector interfaces and ensure a proper assembly.

Art Unit: 2833

As for only one of electrical connectors having an equalizer circuit, it is an obvious expedient since it has been held that omission of an element and its function in a combination where the remaining elements perform the same functions as before involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Karlson*, 136 USPQ 184. is'ual

With regard to claim 3 Fogg does not disclose that the indicator is a difference in size with respect to the other connector.

The above mentioned limitation is not patentably significant since it would be obvious to reduce the size of the connector without equalizer circuit and this limitation relates to the size of the article under consideration which is not ordinarily a matter of invention. *In re Yount*, 36 C.C.P.A. (Patents) 775, 171 F.2d 317, 80 USPQ 141.

With regard to claims 5, 6 Fogg discloses (Fig. 20) that the substrate has at least one passive and active component mounted thereon.

Claims 1,5, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Boutros et al in view of Gwiazdowski.

With regard to claim 1, Boutros et al (US 6,796,806) disclose an electrical cable assembly, comprising: a cable (Fig. 8, 9), and electrical connectors (Fig. 1,16) which are fixed on both ends of the cable and include an electrical contact and a housing storing the electrical contact, wherein electrical connector has an equalizer circuit comprising (3) a substrate electrically interconnected to the cable and to the connector contact. (2) at least one of the electrical connectors has a visual indicator (Abstract, lines 13-16) different from that of the other electrical connector.

The interface configuration at the ends of the cable connector is predetermined by the corresponding configuration of components which are connected with the cable connector. For example, Gwiazdowski et al (US 6,793,515) disclose (col. 7, lines 11-12 identical connections).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Boutros with interchangeable mating surfaces and a visual indicator, as taught by Gwiazdowski et al, to connect components with identical connector interfaces.

Art Unit: 2833

With regard to claims 5, 6 Boutrosi et al discloses that the substrate has at least one passive and active component mounted thereon

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boutros et al in view of Gwiasdovski et al and further in view of Kelly .

With regard to claim 2, Boutros et al disclose all of the limitations except for the visual indicator being a color of a cover housing.

Kelly (US 3,689,866) discloses (col. 4, lines 54-55) the visual indicator being a color of a cover housing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the color identification of the connector, as taught by Kelly , to visually identify the type of the connector

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boutros et al in view of Gwiasdovski et al and further in view of Zhang et al

With regard to claim 7, Boutros et al disclose all of the limitations except for the cable assembly complying with the Digital Visual Interface standard.

Zheng et al (US 6,736,676) disclose that DVI standard is recommended in connector technology for connecting LCD monitors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to follow DVI standard , as taught by Zheng et al , to connect the host to LCD with Boutros et al type of connector

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boutros et al in view of Gwiasdovski et al and further in view of the admitted prior art

With regard to claim 8, Boutros et al disclose all of the limitations except for the cable assembly complying with the High-Definition Multimedia Interface Specification.

As it pointed out in Background section of the current specification (p. 3), HDMI standard is recommended to follow for connection between a host side and PDP.

Art Unit: 2833

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to follow HDMI standard , as taught by the current specification , to connect the host to PDP with Boutros et al type of connector.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander D Gilman whose telephone number is 571 272-2004. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on 571 272-2800 ext. 33. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

04/15/2005

*Alex Gilman*

**ALEXANDER GILMAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**